

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 20, 2008, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 10-18, 20-23 and 30-35 are currently pending under examination, and Claims 1-9, 24-29 and 36-56 are withdrawn. By this Amendment, Claims 10, 15, and 30 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0052], [0054], [0062], [0076], and Fig. 16. The Applicants submit that no new matter is added. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 10-18, 20-23 and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Amini et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,698,021, hereinafter "Amini"). It is noted that Claims 10, 15, and 30 have been amended. To the extent the rejection is applicable to the currently pending claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 10, as amended, recites a method for performing remote video audits, comprising creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items, selecting at least one of the plurality of audit items, obtaining video information regarding the selected audit item, wherein the video information includes video stills, entering a classification for the selected audit item based on reviewing the video information, storing the selected audit item after the classification is entered, and calculating a compliance percentage in one or more reports based on the classification of one or

more such stored audit items. Amended Claims 15 and 30 recite similar features to amended Claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that Amini fails to teach or suggest at least the combination of features of amended Claim 10, as described above, and similarly in amended Claims 15 and 30. The Office Action alleged that Amini teaches each and every element of amended Claims 10, 15, and 30. More particular, the Office Action alleges that Amini as cited teaches entering a classification for the selected audit item based on viewing, as shown in Amini, col. 9, lines 55-65. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Col. 9, lines 55-65 merely describes that in Amini, a detection of a change in state of an event variable prompts camera server 314 to notify ImageCaptureApplication 510 of the occurrence of the event. The notification may be performed by sending an email. However, such notification is different from “entering a classification for the selected audit item based on reviewing the video information,” as recited in amended Claim 1. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Amini that a user is able to classify the selected audit item. There is further no disclosure or suggest in Amini to store the selected audit item after the classification is entered calculate a compliance percentage in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items, as recited in amended Claim 1. As shown in Figs. 9A-10C, the user can select playing the video, stop playing the video, zooming in and out, and controlling pans and tilts, but not entering a classification for the selected audit item based on reviewing the video information audit item, as recited in amended Claim 1. The Office Action further alleged that Amini teaches, at col. 6, lines 10-35, col. 5, lines 30-35, and col. 17, lines

45-55, the classification is selected from a group consisting of as Pass or Fail, Not Audited, and Don't know, as recited in Claim 23. However, Amini as cited merely describes a client certificate that is authorized to access the system, accessing video image data that is captured by a plurality of security camera, and enabling the workstation to perform camera controls. These features are not relevant to entering a classification, such as Pass or Fail, Not Audited, and Don't know.

Accordingly, at least for the above-mentioned reasons, amended Claims 10, 15, and 30 are allowable over Amini.

As amended Claims 10, 15, and 30 are allowable, Claims 11-14, 16-18, 20-23 and 31-35 are likewise allowable at least due to their dependencies from allowable independent claims and additional features recited therein.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together

with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing Docket Number 024478-00023.

Respectfully submitted,



Wan-Ching Montfort
Registration Number 56,127

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

WLC/CYM